

MOREHOUSE

The careers of the Count of Artois
and the Count of Provence from the
beginning of the emigration to the period
of Napoleonic control, in their relation
to the Émigré legislation of 1789-1800

History

A. B.

1910

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

Class

1910

Book

M81

Volume

Mr10-20M



The Careers of the Count of Artois and the Count of
Provence from the beginning of the Emigration to the
period of Napoleonic control, in their relation to
the Emigré Legislation of 1789-1800.

by

Frances Milton Irene Morehouse

Thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in History

in the

College of Literature and Arts

of the

University of Illinois

June, 1910

1.- 25 Fill Gaig

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

June 1, 1900

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Miss Frances Morehouse

ENTITLED The Careers of the Count of Artois and the Count
of Provence in their Relation to the Emigré Legislation of 1789-1800

IS APPROVED BY ME AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Bachelor of Arts

Guy Stanton Ford,


Instructor in Charge

APPROVED:

E. B. Greene

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF

History.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/careersofcountof00more>

The Careers of the Count of Artois and the Count of Provence from the beginning of the Emigration to the period of Napoleonic control, in their relation to the Émigré Legislation of 1789-1800.

The struggle between Old and New in the France of 1789 to 1800 was of so multiform and complex a character that a merely approximate analysis must needs be incomplete and to some extent misleading. The political strife between the monarchy and the new democracy was the most obvious part of that struggle; it began the visible manifestation of change in 1789, and in various phases occupied the foreground of the drama of transformation through the following years. Social, economic, intellectual and ethical evolution went on simultaneously with political development, as inevitably and as thoroughly. But in the nature of things the visible form of government offered the first, the most easily seen and most unmistakable expression of changing ideals, and in it we may find the surest index to this period of human growth.

The new government initiated with the calling of the States-General was to usher in a new era; for that, definitely, it was created. Co-operation between the old monarchy and the advocates of the new order had been so long and so consistently denied that it needed but the few months between May, 1789, and August, 1792, to prove it a practical impossibility. The years between the beginning of the Revolution and the rise of the power of Napoleon are filled, then, with the struggle of the beneficiaries of an outgrown system to reëstablish their ancient privileges. Those beneficiaries who profited most by the old order naturally led the stubborn retreat; Louis XVI, during the short remainder of his numbered days, afterward his two brothers, who were in days to come

known respectively as Louis XVII and Charles X. The object of this study is to show how the reactionary characters of these two men, representing a house which history and long tradition had endeared to the French people, and the careers and activities dictated by their ideas, influenced the attitude of the French nation toward the old regime, and effectively prevented a restoration of the monarchy.

The Two Brothers of the King.

Of the two men, the elder, Louis-Stanislaus-Xavier, comte de Provence, was a far more impressive figure than was Charles-Phillippe, comte d'Artois. He possessed a character of genuine Bourbon obstinacy, combined with rare patience and faithfulness to friends and to principle. He was more rather than less narrow than the average French courtier of his time; not even the iconoclasm of 18th century philosophy seems to have produced in his mind any serious doubt of the divine and absolute character of the rule of kings. The opposition to his brother's despotic rule, which he maintained up to the eve of the Revolution, was rather the result of personal ambition and a desire for popularity, than of any real or deep-seated sympathy for liberalism. His advocacy of double representation in the Tiers Etat was, he afterward declared, one of

1. Born at Versailles, Nov. 17, 17⁵⁵, he was 10 years of age when his father died. His education was conducted by churchmen; of the four sons of the Dauphin, he was the most intellectual, grave and studious. May 9, 1771, he married Marie-Joséphine of Savoy. There was no issue to this marriage. Provence was grand-master of the order of St. Lazare of Jerusalem, a liberal patron of the arts and sciences, and a man of some literary ability.

2. Manuscrit inédit de Louis XVIII, avec portrait et facsimile. Paris, 1839.

great mistakes of his life; and it is certain that from the time of the opening of the Estates General, he retired from active politics, and appeared in that body only when the king needed his presence and support. He was not without the vices of his time and station, and was incapable of comprehending even existing conditions, to say nothing of conceiving future developments. But to his own limited conceptions of right he was sincerely true; he may at least be said to have been a figure more pathetic than despicable. He possessed good taste, good sense in many things, tact, temperance; qualities which did not fail to command respectful admiration from a court fully capable of recognizing worth, especially when that worth showed itself in the royal family. Although a true Bourbon in yielding to the control of favorites, in this respect, as in most respects, he showed always far more strength than did Artois. His invariable good-nature and cheerfulness, his strength and constancy, springing from a buoyant faith in the inevitableness of his restoration, was the vital thing, the inspiration point, in the long struggle of the émigrés in the years to come. He was a prince whom no mere circumstance of a progressive humanity should rob of his ancient Heaven-given right to rule a people.

The Count of Artois¹ was 32 years old at the time of the storming of the Bastille. He had had a pseudo-military training,

1. Charles-Philippe, born at Versailles October 9, 1757, died at Gratz, Styria, November 6, 1836. He was married to Marie-Therese of Savoy, November 16, 1773. In 1771, Louis XV created him Chevalier du St. Esprit. In 1778, he made a tour of the ports of the western coasts; in the same year he fought his notorious duel with the Duke of Bourbon. In 1782, he was made a chevalier of St. Louis after spending a week in camp at Gibraltar.

and was a rococo play-general, reviewing troops in a uniform of apple-green silk, with a black picture-hat framing his face.¹ Although his silly and conceited behavior had earned the contempt of even the supercilious court of Louis XVI, he was not entirely without friends. He could be amiable enough with those he liked, and had even his devoted followers, of whom perhaps the Count of Rézecques was most favored, and the Count Eszterhazy most faithful. Some unpleasant personal peculiarities, among them that of keeping his mouth open, added to his unpopularity, which was founded on the certainty of his treacherousness, irreverence, and illimitable conceit. He was always frankly in favor of the most absolute kingly rule; his opposition to the reëstablishment of the parlements had been especially strong. Although he was, to a less degree, a patron of letters and a friend to learned societies, like his brother, he was always heartily disliked by the French people, who doubted his sincerity and held his pretensions in contempt. His wife, a sister of the Countess of Provence and a daughter of Victor-Amadeus III of Sardinia, was spared what might otherwise have been the boredom of enduring him, by a natural stupidity of temperament which was proof against any lack on the part of her husband. Compared with her mental passivity, the childish effervescence of her husband shone brilliantly enough. "She exists," says Mercy Argenteau, "in the most perfect state of nullity."

Such were the chief figures in the protesting minority of the French nation during the first years of the establishment of the new order. With them were the king's aunts, intriguing agents of a worldly Church, jealously opposed to the beautiful

1. Vaublanc, *Souvenirs*, Vol. I, page 69.

2. Forneron, Vol. I, page 52.

Austrian who sat on the throne; the sub-royal houses of Condé, Rohan, Richelieu, Noailles, also antagonistic to Marie Antoinette; a numerous and intricately organized court, seething with intrigue, corrupt to the core, and effeminized to a degree that showed itself unmistakably in the panic-stricken emigration. In all the mass of that spangled, richly-wrought fabric, which shimmered with deceptive color and glow under the glaring light which beats upon a throne, was warp and woof of two common motives: first, to perpetuate in their own class the privilege that the past had handed down to them; second, to appropriate individually as much of that Privilege as could possibly be kept from the other individuals of the same class. The court was essentially, unchangeably, aesthetically selfish.

Artois and the first Emigration.

Knowing that the people justly regarded his brother as the epitome of the extravagance, the moral decadence, and the indifference of the court, it was for him that Louis XVI feared most when the news of the fall of the Bastille reached him. To have Artois out of the way would not only save him from possible violence from the mob, but would remove a court intriguer whose unscrupulous behavior had often embarrassed the King of Good Intentions, and whose presence at such a crisis could not be other than a menace or a nuisance. Therefore the king ordered Charles, count of Artois, to leave Versailles and the kingdom. Not loath, for the smell of blood had thoroughly scared him, he slipped from the palace on the night of 16-17 July, 1789, riding fast to Chantilly, whence a carriage of the Prince of Condé carried them on to Valenciennes.¹

1. Daudet, *Historie de l'Emigration*, Vol. I, page 2.
(referred to hereafter simply as Daudet.)

In the party with the prince were the Prince de'Henin, captain of his personal guard, his friend the Count of Vandreuil, the Marquis of Blignac, and the Baron Castelnau, gentlemen of his house.

M. de Sarent, tutor to his two sons, d'Angoulême and de Berry, took the boys to the northern frontier, whence they were to be conducted to the court of their grandfather at Turin. At Valenciennes was the Hungarian count, Valentin Eszterhazy, the first of the courtiers in the favor of the queen, and entirely devoted to the interests of the royal house. He received the fugitives with the greatest kindness, and discussed with them the question of their destination.¹ Then, after a short rest, he sent Artois with his suite on to Brussels, where they arrived in the last days of July.

As sheep or geese follow a panic-stricken leader, such of the courtiers as could had followed the flight of Artois. At Chantilly and Valenciennes their hurrying carriages had even passed the prince. They were in hysterical rout, half-ashamed and half-amused at their own precipitate flight; led by the Condé's and the Guises, and leaving their fortunes, for the few days they expected to be gone from Versailles, with Durvet, the court banker, or depositing them with Finguerlin at Strasburg. The joke was on them, they admitted with amused chagrin;² but no shadow of the ghastliness of that long joke seems to have crossed the dusty path of the court fugitives, who

1. Eszterhazy advised Spain, while Artois was in favor of hastening at once to the safe shelter of his wife's relatives. Finally it was decided to go on to Brussels, where events in Paris could be watched, and a further course decided on.

2. Forneron, Vol. I, page 5.

pell-mell tumbled out of Versailles in mid-July to escape for a few days the silly, beastly violence of the canaille.- Besenval and Vauguyon were arrested as they fled, and imprisoned at Brie and Havre respectively.² All the border cities received additions to their population during these days, which became in time a source of serious embarrassment. So began the great Emigration.

At Brussels, Artois received the first of the long series of rebuffs which the years of his exile were fated to bring him. Marie-Christine, sister to Joseph II and Marie-Antoinette, was vice-regent there. Having been on friendly terms with his sister-in-law the queen at the moment of his departure, Artois thought he might expect a welcome and an asylum from her. But Marie-Christine, acting on instructions from her brother, who never allowed family ties to interfere with policies of state, directed him to leave Brussels if possible, or at least to live there incognito.³ To live otherwise than as a prince was an impossible thing to Artois then, undisciplined as he was to any self-denial; he would go to Turin at once. Castelneau was despatched to Victor-Amadeus, to announce his coming and beg for asylum and succor. He arrived on the 4th of September, and succeeded in making all necessary plans.

1. Ferneron, Vol. I, page 200.

2. Letters d' Aristocrats: Vergennes to Bellefleur, pages 82 and 87. Also Seuffe to Mme. de Doué, 139.
(Pierre de Vaissiere, Letters d' Aristocrats. Paris, 1907.
Hereafter referred to by title only.)

3. Letters d' Aristocrats, M. Guillemeau de Saint-Souplet to his brother, page 356.

Traveling quietly with a few friends, Artois made his way through Germany and Switzerland to Turin, arriving about ten days after Castelnau. He was well received, his wife having applied to her father for shelter before her husband, and Louis XVI having granted his kingly permission. Comfortable houses near the royal summer residence were assigned to the fugitives. In a short time a considerable portion of the court of Versailles was transplanted to Turin, and there entertained courteously. Choiseul had come to Turin early in the autumn; there were there also the three princes Condé, and the young dukes of Angoulême and of Berry. The Condés, in a house in Turin, had a suite of 45 persons; Artois had 82. They might have been very happy, in spite of the threatening conditions in France, but for the fact that their ready money was beginning to give out. Here first appeared the sordid specter that was to haunt all the days of the exile, and even to menace the long-delayed Restoration.

By the middle of October, 1789, many more emigrants had come to join the count and his friends, fugitives who thought it inexpedient to follow The Baker to Paris. Hordes of people, including members of the Third Estate, fled after the 6th of October; many found their way to Turin.¹ The Duke of Orleans had left Paris on the 6th of October; Mounier even advised the king to leave, but Louis either could not bring himself to so radical an action, or found it impossible to escape. At Turin, the talk of vengeance, of appeal to the courts of Europe, alarmed the cautious Choiseul;²

1. Daudet, Vol. I, page 37. Also, *Lettres d'Aristocrats*, Vergennes to Bellejeant, page 98.

2. Daudet, Vol. I, page 12.

but none spoke seriously of recourse to arms.¹ The king of Sardinia, as yet unwearied by his role of host, entertained the French nobles graciously, and between hunting-parties Artois and his advisers were busied with an extensive correspondence. Joseph II could not at this time be prevailed upon to interfere with the course of French affairs. Two Italian governments, Sardinia and Naples, bound to the French Bourbons by family ties, made reluctant and impotent protest. Help from Spain might reasonably be expected, but Spain was divided and troubled with many things at home, and assistance from that quarter came too late to be available.

During 1790, while Louis was practically a prisoner in Paris, Artois remained at Turin. If his efforts to secure help for his brother were ineffectual, their failure can not justly be attributed to a lack of willingness or efficiency on his part; no king was at that time so unoccupied or so daring as to care to enter the lists in defense of the tottering throne of France. Early in 1791 the prince left Turin and went to Verona, where he lived quietly, half hid. Calonne was there, desperately urging upon the self-centered Emperor the necessity of intervention. He, with M. de Conzié, archbishop of Arras, and the Count of Vaudreuil, had undertaken the direction of the politics of the Emigration.

1. Not all the emigrants, even much later, favored armed resistance or invasion. The Marquis of Vibraye, in a letter to the Marquis of the Quenille (August 30, 1791, from Brussels), gives in detail his reasons for not joining the royalist forces. *Lettres d'Aristocrates*, pages 342-345.

In February, 1791, the two daughters of Louis XV, Victoire and Adelaide, decided to leave Paris; they wished, they said, to be where they could be attended by a canonical confessor, and so chose Rome (in preference to Spain, which had been considered) as a place of residence. Contemporary events indicate that a fear of the women of Paris, who hated them, had also its part to play in their desertion of their nephew the king.¹ They drove to Moret, where the rabble, discovering their identity, wished to hang them, according to the expeditious revolutionary custom to the nearest lamp-post.² Escaping that, they gained Arnay-le-duc, where further adventures befel them, and finally Turin and Rome. At Rome they established one of those quarrelsome little courts in which the slight strength of the exiled Bourbons frittered itself away during the years of the exile. Louise, whom Marie-Antoinette had called "the most intriguing little Carmelite in the kingdom", and who was pious to the nuisance-point, coöperated with her sisters and with the Church, whose willing tool she was. She and Adelaide had led the court opposition to Marie-Antoinette--the cabal which included the Countesses of Provence and Artois (Sardinian princesses naturally antagonistic to the Austrian) and the houses of Condé, Noailles, Rohan, and Richelieu. Madame Elizabeth remained in Paris, reporting everything that transpired at court to Artois, whom she adored.³

1. Their letters to the king (January 22, and 25, 1791), are given in Archives National, C 220-221, doss. 160¹⁴⁸. On February 1 the Society of the Friends of the Constitution at Versailles sent word of their intended flight to the Jacobin Club of Paris. See Arch. Nat., Comité des recherches, D XXIX B, 33. (Lettres d'Aristocrates, page 221.)

2. Fernerren, Vol I. page 210 and following.
Daudet, Vol I, page 58.

3. This correspondence was especially useful to the emigrants at Coblenz. It was carried on secretly through Mme. de Raigecourt. Daudet, Vol. I, page 28.

Provence did not leave the king when Artois did, and had been effect-¹ually prevented from leaving the capital when his aunts fled. He was trying to help the king, vacillating between various policies dictated in turn by good-nature, Bourbon stubbornness, and the pressure of the Assembly, to shape some sort of consistent policy worthy a monarch. Provence was himself as incapable of real progress as any Bourbon prince; his claim to distinction lies, not in any intrinsic difference from the rest of his race, but rather in a certain concentration of such virtues as the family could claim, in a character which possessed singular tenacity, patience, and buoyancy. All his efforts now, owing to the king's weak good-nature and the queen's foolish fears, were in vain.

After a short time at Verona, Artois decided to join the forces gathering for the royal defense on the eastern border of France. At Frankfort, at Cologne, at Mayence, Worms, Coblenz, Bayreuth, Mannheim,² the royalist forces were being mobilized under the three princes Condé. Before leaving Italy, however, he had an interview with the Emperor Léopold, secured by much skillful manœuvring of the royal agents at Venice and Florence. In this interview, held 17th of May at Mantua, the Emperor begged Artois to abandon his project of going to the Rhine, and to stay quietly (not to say, harmlessly) at Turin. But Artois was weary of Italy. He fancied that in Germany he might be less hampered by the restraining agents of his brother the king, and that from there it might be possible to reënter France with Condé's conquering troops.

1. Lettres d'Aristocrates, Mme de Hermon to M. Desilles, page 237-238.

2. Daudet, Vol. I, page 68.

He sent to Louis an account of the interview-- which he had been expressly forbidden to secure---with Léopold's vaguely reassuring hopes of some future championship by the Powers, rosily transformed into promises of speedy intervention. Then he betook himself to Germany, where, after some indefinite wandering in search of welcome and succor, he went to Coblenz. It was at this early stage of his wanderings that, being much in need of funds, he sent his diamonds to Holland to be sold.

On the evening of the 15th of June, 1791, Artois arrived in Coblenz, with a suite of 60 persons, including Calonne and Conzié, the bishop of Arras. On the 23rd, the Princes Condé came from Worms to see him, and a long conference as to ways and means took place. On the 24th came a letter from Monsieur (Provence) with news of the flight from Paris on the night of the 20-21 June. His wife, he said, was safe at Tournay, and he himself had gained Mons, whence he should go at once to Brussels, there to await the orders of the king. Artois set out at once to meet him there, and not until reaching the Flemish city did he hear, from Provence himself, of the arrest at Varennes.

After Varennes, to the Regency.

Loquaciousness was a fault of the Count of Artois which defeated his plans and embarrassed his cause continually; no experience of its ill effects could cure him of it, no efforts of his friends could counteract it. At Brussels, Marie-Christine, acting for the Emperor, warned Artois not to talk. Artois' self-esteem could ill brook a reproof, and as there was little to keep them at Brussels, and much of activity at Coblenz to call them back to the gathering armies, the brothers returned to the Rhine in early

July.¹ At Aix-la-Chapelle, on the way, they had an interview with the king of Sweden, and at Bonn there occurred a somewhat stormy and stubborn encounter with Breteuil, the agent of King Louis. Returned to Coblentz, they were established at Schoenbornlust, where they held a court for 15 months which was the center of emigrant activity against revolutionized France. Royal honors were paid them by the French nobles; in all the crowds of fawning followers, however, there seem at this time to have been few who were wholly disinterested.² The little court was well housed and not without brilliance. The Countess of Provence was there, and the two young dukes with their tutor de Serent, although their mother had remained at Turin. Calonne, (stationed two leagues from Coblentz, and communicating with the princes daily by a courier), the Prince of Nassau-Siegen, Baron Flachslanden, Conzié, Broglie (who was organizing the military force of the princes), Jaucourt, Vandreuil, attended Provence and Artois. Daily councils, endless correspondence, endless intrigue, countless orders and counter-orders, the appointment of agents and officers,³ and the consideration of messages from the Powers, occupied the days; many pleasures for they were still French nobles, filled the long evenings. The court was not harmonious, Provence, Artois, and Condé having each his separate following of unscrupulous partisans. Artois' adherents were at this time most numerous, for Artois possessed

1. Daudet, Vol. I, page 77.

2. Daudet, Vol. I, page 82.

3. For an enumeration of the most important of these, see Daudet, Vol. I, page 97 and following.

many qualities which attract men. He was lavish in giving promises, and more than the others aped in his exile the gorgeous millinery of Versailles,¹ even when the common soldiers at Worms² were being driven to suicide by their frightful sufferings.

The trip of Artois to Pilnitz, begun August 13, 1791, was disastrous in several ways. Nothing was really accomplished for the royal cause, and some positive harm done. The prince had been received with distinction at Berlin, previous to the Conference, and had a somewhat exaggerated idea of his own consequence. As at Mantua, Artois at Pilnitz far over-estimated the friendliness of the Prussian and Austrian rulers, and placed a confidence in their empty promises which does small credit to his perspicacity. From Pilnitz he went to Dresden with the king of Prussia, sent Eszterhazy thence to St. Petersburg, and returned to Provence at Coblenz. The boastful, self-confident letter of the two princes to Louis XVI, following the Conference, amounted to a declaration of war. Nothing could more have hurt the royal cause, except perhaps their defiant answer to Louis' summons in September. "Cein! Cein!", exclaimed the queen, when the foolish document was read to her. The queen, never very cautious, was so indignant at Provence that Fersen warned her not to discuss him with others. The bond of a common misfortune seemed never to unite the Bourbon family factions, and the two courts at Paris and at Coblenz could never work together. With respect to the relations between the princes

1. Daudet Vol. I, page 102.

2. The Empress Catherine sent them ten millions to be used in military operations. It seems that very little of this money was used for paying soldiers.

and the Assembly, things were in even worse shape. The Assembly sent its last appeal to Provence on December 6, 1791; and his reply alienated such friends as he had left in that body.

Throughout the spring of 1791 the two brothers were prominent figures in the preparations for the invasion of France. Artois broke his promise to lead the revolting peasants of Jâlès, who were uselessly and wantonly¹ butchered; but he consented to join the invading forces of Brunswick. In the middle of July, the two princes went to Mayence,² where there was a great show of troops and preparations; back to Coblenz along the Rhine, and thence with Brunswick into France for the campaign of the fall of 1792. In that campaign Provence and Artois commanded troops of French gentlemen. They issued a manifesto on the occasion of their entering France (August 8, 1792) stating the motives of the invasion. Brunswick entered the country on the 10th of August, a day of vast importance to the French and to the royalists; the émigré regiments in his wake advanced to within three leagues of Rheims. But at the Meuse the princes disbanded their little army, the greater part of which joined the troops of Conde. Neither of the princes showed any signs³ of military ability or any marked qualities of leadership.

After the disastrous failure of that invasion, Coblenz, threatened by Custrine, was no longer safe for the brothers of

1. Ferneron, Vol. I, page 312.

2. Daudet, Vol. I, page 201.

3. See "L'Emigration d'après le journal inédit d'un Emigré" by Marquis de Saporta, (Revue des Questions Historiques, Vol 46, pages 510-571), pages 530-531.

Louis XVI, and they wandered to Liège, whence they sent an appeal to Frederick William III for asylum in his realm. It was the wish of Provence to go to Madrid, and to send his brothers to St. Petersburg; but they had not money wherewith to travel to the next town. Artois had been arrested at Maestricht for debt; the penniless¹ princes had neither home nor resource. But in December Frederick William III offered them Hamm on the Lippe, near Düsseldorf in Westphalia. Stein was commissioned to look after them,² and Catherine, tardily thoughtful of their welfare, shared with the Prussian king the cost of their support. The trip to St. Petersburg was not given up; indeed, the search for means for its realization was part of the business of the early part of the stay at Hamm.

The Regency.

The princes reached Hamm late in 1792; on January 28, 1793, following the arrival of the news of the execution of Louis XVI, Provence issued a proclamation to the French, proclaiming the reign of the dauphin, under his regency. The inevitable Artois was lieutenant-general of the kingdom. Marie-Antoinette, imprisoned and watched closely, sent the king's private letters to Monsieur, through her faithful friend M. de Jarjayes.³ So the Regency began, in exile and poverty and impotence; a regency whose one great object and aim was Revenge.⁴ Just at its beginning, the

1. The emigres took an important part in the operations of the siege of Maestricht. See "Les Emigres au Siege de Maestricht in 1793" by R. Javergue: Revue des Questions Historiques, Vol 63, page 516.

2. For his rather favorable impressions, see Pertz-Leben Stein, Vol. I, pages 135-136.

3. For the services of M. de Jarjayes and his wife, see Histoire de Marie-Antoinette, par Edmond et Jules de Goncourt, page 380 and following. (Paris, 1859.)

4. Daudet, Vol I. page 219.

defeat of the Republican armies on the Rhine by the Prussian army, and in the Netherlands by the Prince of Coburg, (who signed a treaty with Dumonriez in which Louis XVII was recognized as king of France, gave hope that the anti-monarchical movement might be defeated. But the cabinet at Vienna promptly undid what Cobourg had accomplished for them, and the two princes resigned themselves to another period of waiting.

The cherished plan for a presentation of the royalist cause at the court of Catherine II was carried out in the spring of 1793. Artois arrived in St. Petersburg in May, was well received, and was allowed to air his professedly belligerent intentions with a freedom whose import, as usual, he vastly overrated. Catherine was, however, really interested, and wrote a fervent letter to George III of England, which Grenville set aside as of small importance. Catherine granted Artois her permission to lead an armed attempt at Restoration, suggesting that he utilize the threatened insurrection in La Vendée. She presented him a jeweled sword, well worthy a prince of the House of Bourbon, and with it her sincere wishes that he might use it to win both fame and kingdom.¹ The gift was a fortunate one, for although it could bring neither fame nor happiness nor kingdom to the receiver, the sale of the jewels in the hilt supported the spendthrift prince through the next winter. Meanwhile, negotiations with England seeming favorable, the prince was taken from Russia to England, and landed at Hull, May 16, 1793.

1. Catherine regarded Artois as a modern Henry IV and even advised him to read the memoirs of that monarch for his example and inspiration. The attitude of Catherine toward the Emigration is carefully and fully considered in "Catherine II et l'Emigration Francaise" by M.L. Pingaud: *Revue des Questions Historiques*, Vol 28, pages 430-490.

But Grenville would have none of his presence at London, and the poor prince went back to the safe refuge of Hamm with little accomplished.

Little could be done, in fact, by the most skillful of the royalists, at this time of the height of the reaction against absolutism. The feeling of powerlessness possessing the regent is shown in some of the letters of this period, notably one to the ex-mayor of Arles, who had emigrated to Constance. This personage, Louis de la Chassagne, thought that the agitations of 1793 in Provence offered a favorable chance of restoration, but was told by the Duke of Serrent, for the king, that it was useless to act just at that time.¹

Provence failed to reach Toulon to lead a royalist rising in the summer of 1793. He had been invited to furnish inspiration² to that city in its struggle against the Republic. Leaving Hamm, and traveling through middle Germany and the Tyrol to Turin, he stopped in his journey, perhaps at the suggestion of the English, until the news came of the fall of Toulon. This was a severe blow, which ended for the time being any hopes that the cabinet at Vienna would recognize the Regency. Provence took the name of Comte de l'Isle, or Comte de Lille, and settled down in Northern Italy. Nothing was left now but the Vendée, and the endless machinations of the clever d'Antraigues, who was guiding the course of royalist politics from Venice. The fall of the Committee and of Robespierre offered a fallacious hope of restoration, but as Provence would

1. Letter of Louis de la Chassagne, probably to the Count of La Chapelle, April 25, 1793. In *La Revolution Francaise* for July-December, 1885, page 83.

2. In November, 1793.

make no compromise and the republic would make no concession, an agreement was as far off as ever. Little news, and that little unreliable, came from the Vendée to d'Antraigues at Venice or Provence at Verona. The latter city had obtained permission from the Committee of Public Safety to receive the French prince, and he had removed there in May, 1794. D'Antraigue kept his agents busy in every French city, and especially in Paris. Scheme after scheme was originated, elaborated, disseminated and abandoned. The Republic was as yet too strongly entrenched, except perhaps in the Vendée. If England would support the regent there, he might lead victorious arms from Brittany to Paris itself. Harcourt, theatrically entreated to secure for the king of France the right to find for himself "a throne or a tomb"¹, finally secured permission for him to go to Brittany, and transportation in an English ship. Overjoyed, the regent hastened the preparations for his departure, and was about to start, when news arrived which changed every plan. The Dauphin was dead.

Artois, likewise anxious to show his mettle in the Vendée, and having made the necessary arrangements with Pitt, left Ham for Rotterdam in August, 1794. From there he hoped to go to London with his elder son, d'Angoulême, who was known as the comte de Chatellerault². But he was kept with the Duke of York in The Low-

1. Article on Louis XVIII in Michauds' Biographie Universelle: Vol. 25, page 246.

2. Artois himself took the pseudonym of comte de Ponthieu. His other son, the Duke of Berry, 16 years old, was at this time with Condé in Germany. He had little taste for camp life, and seems to have resented the restrictions of the elder prince Condé. (See the letter of Berry, written from near Karlsruhe, May 17, 1795, in La Revue Française for January-June, 1886, page 736).

lands until his mercurial courage and enthusiasm gave way to indifference, if not cowardice, - treated always with courtesy and distinction, but given, much to his avowed disappointment, no military command, and never allowed to risk his life in action.¹ When the Austrian and English armies left the Netherlands in January, 1795, he was left behind, and there he remained until England at last invited him to accompany an expedition then preparing for the Vendee. Puisaye, the hero of that rising, was then in command of the insurgent royalists there. The Revolution produced few men of a more unselfish and noble devotion than characterized this general, and few who suffered more from the injustice and ingratitude of others. During that spring and summer he fought bravely, with his Chouans, about Quiberon, keeping back the Republican forces, and awaiting the coming of the promised Count of Artois. Artois reached London in July, 1795, and on August 25th appeared at Spithead. On the 13th of September, aboard the English ship Jason, he was seen at Quiberon. Never, during the days of the desperate² struggle waged there, ending in Hoche's defeat of the royalists, did he join the fighting soldiers or risk his life by leaving the British man-of-war. On the 25th of November he returned to London, still on the Jason.

Quiberon was the last stand of the fighting emigrants and the loyal peasantry of the North for king and kingdom. No loyalty could stand the test of such disillusionment as came to those who, sacrificing so much, saw their coward prince unwilling to take his place as their leader at the most critical point of the struggle.

The royalist cause was lost beyond hope of redemption or help.

1. Daudet, Vol I, page 274

2. July 16-21, 1795

3. Histoire de France: Montgaillard, Vol 3, 405

for many years at Quiberon; and when it triumphed again, it was from no virtue or action of its own, but simply as the passive and temporary reaction from other and stronger movements. Artois was sent to Edinburg, and installed at the castle of Holyrood. Here while history was making far to the south of him, Prince Charles played whist through the long evenings of the Scotch winter and on Sundays ventured outside the walls for an outing, since creditors could not arrest him on the holy day. He changed little, save for a tardy piety which he affected after the death of Mme. de Polastron.

Emigre Legislation.

At the time when Artois left Versailles the Assembly had just sent Bailly to Paris with the good news that Neckar had been recalled and that the king had ordered the withdrawal of Boscawen's¹ troops. In the interest that attended the creation, for Bailly, of the new office of Mayor of Paris, the formation of the National Guards under La Fayette, and the king's visit to Paris, the beginning of the Emigration caused less of a sensation than might have been expected. The Assembly had before it the tremendous task of endowing France with a Constitution; to this, during the two years that followed, it devoted every possible energy. Until it was finished, the question of the treatment of renegade French citizens did not present itself as one requiring immediate and drastic legislation. In February, 1790, the matter was discussed, but no decree passed. On the 23rd of the next July, however, unobtrusively sandwiched between lists of outworn remains of feudalism, well worthy consignment to the legal brush-heap, the right of emigration

1. Lettres d'Aristocrates: Marquis of Billeury to M. de Savigny, July 17, 1789, pages 54-64.

¹
 was prohibited. The law was a dead letter, as far as that clause was concerned, and on February 25 and 28, 1791, the National Assembly decided to adjourn a discussion of an anti-emigration law, as the Constitutional Assembly had a year before.

Consequently, the long series of Émigré laws did not begin, as effective legislation, until the gathering of forces upon the frontiers threatened France with actual invasion. The first decree was passed June 6, 1791, and is a good example of the legislation of panic; it set the death penalty for insurrection, for furnishing aid, information, or supplies to the enemy, or opposing French interests in any way. ² The second was directed specifically toward Condé, and was passed June 13-15, 1791--about a week before the flight to Varennes. It deprived Condé of his rights of succession in case he did not at once return. ³

The decree of June 6 is the first of a series of about 300 laws, passed between June, 1791, and the end of 1799, regulating the treatment of emigrants and their families, or the administration of their confiscated property. ⁴ On the day following the flight of the king's family, a law was passed ordering the arrest of any and

1. Collection des Lois, Duvergier: VI, 253. Referred to hereafter as Duvergier.

2. Archives Parlementaire, XXVII, 13. Also, Lettres d'Aristocrats, (M. de Maiche to his father,) 322.

3. Duvergier, III, 13.

4. Of the 300, only about 100 laws deal exclusively or chiefly with the definition, prevention or punishment of emigration. The other two-thirds prescribe the endless red tape of administering the confiscated property, fixing relations between private creditors and the nation, or otherwise regulating financial matters.

all persons leaving the country, and forbidding to take arms, munitions, or horses out of the country. The knowledge of the king's flight, which became general in the city early in the morning, had been carried also to Versailles, and was announced by the president, Beauharnais, at the opening of the session.

The king's attempted desertion and his ostentatious repudiation of his sacred promises, the flight of Provence, the intrigues of the queen, caused public opinion rapidly to be unified against the king in the days following the flight. The impossibility of that compromise between king and people, between royal power and popular privilege, for which the Assembly had been working in its task of framing the Constitution, began to appear to that body. Ideas of republicanism, of extreme democracy, began to manifest themselves. A summary of the laws against the emigrants or their leaders, passed between this time and the close of the century, shows a gradual crystallization of public sentiment against the emigrants, growing severity of judgment, and increasing facility in the appropriation of their property. The laws on confiscation have small concern with a study of the careers of the Bourbon princes as they affected, or were affected by, French politics; but the sentiment of the people, as shown in the laws, toward the princes and their followers, is germane to our subject, and may show both cause, and, more especially, effect of the characters and actions of the princes.

In July, 1791, heavy fines were decreed for those who, being out of the kingdom, should not return within one month. In August

1. Duvergier, Vol III, page 53.

2. Duvergier, Vol. III, page 101.

the decree was repeated, and careful surveillance of returned emigrants prescribed in addition, with much official regulation of their conduct.¹ Then, following the signing of the Constitution by the king, on September 3, came a short and sharp reaction. The law of August 6 was absolutely revoked, and French citizens were given the right to travel freely in the kingdom, and to leave it at will.² Nevertheless, in October the different departments were required to send to the ministers the names, stations and homes of those in their territory who had emigrated.³ These were the first of the Emigrant lists, which were to figure so prominently in French history during the next ten years. On November 9, following the reading of alarming reports from the Lou-Rhin, and a long discussion, in which several radical opponents of emigration took part, the death sentence was decreed for emigrants on the frontier.⁴ The king, a few days later, issued rather pathetic appeals to his runaway officers and people,⁵ similar to one he had addressed in October to his brothers.⁶ In this appeal he asked for their return on the grounds of his devoted loyalty to them in vetoing the law of 9th November, and intimates that force will be used if gratitude and loyalty do not win their obedience.

1. Duvergier, Vol. III, page 177.

2. Duvergier, Vol. III, page 267.

3. Archives Parlementaire, Vol XXXIV, page 154

4. Forneron, Vol. I, page 223; Archives Parlementaire, XXXIV, page 724.

5. Archives Parlementaire, XXXIV, page 323

6. Archives Parlementaire, XXXIV, page 325.

To this, with the utmost suavity, the emigrants flung back an answer from their safe vantage-ground beyond the Rhine, on New Year's Day. It was addressed to the king but aimed at the people, and was based on the plausible and very correct assumption that the king's approval of a constitution and a liberal government was forced upon him by the new government. Therefore, real loyalty to him required that they be guilty of seeming disobedience; they would never return to France until they could do so with a force that would defeat the Revolutionary government and restore to Louis his ancient rights and privileges.¹

The princes and Calonne, their minister, were accused of treason by an Assembly decree of the very day of the princes' reply to Louis; and on the 9th of February all the property of emigrants was declared confiscated. This law was a financial expedient which came like the proverbial straw to a drowning man, and being clutched at, proved a help so potent that it was tested to the limit of its legal practicability. There had been an alarming deficit in the treasury since the previous August; consequently the idea of confiscation may be attributed rather to the pressing need, which seemed to justify almost any means, than to any desire for revenge on the emigrants. Confiscation simply offered the nearest approach to a sound excuse for a proceeding of expedient injustice.

As the recalcitrants did not return, in the next March a six-months residence law was promulgated, depriving government pensioners of their stipends if they could not prove continued residence in France for the first six months of 1792.² At the end of the month this requirement was extended to cover the cases of

1. Archives Parlementaire, Vol. XXXVI, page 740

2. Archives Parlementaire, Vol. XL, page 397

emigrant priests and ecclesiastics, as well as nobles and officers. In August the municipalities were enjoined to "watch and protect" with especial vigilance the fathers, mothers, wives and children of emigrants, who were forbidden to leave their municipalities without permission.² The law was somewhat milder than that urged by Merlin of Thionville, passed and then revoked, in the preliminary discussions, which proposed that the families of emigrants should be held as hostages; but the execution of the law was probably as severe as circumstances seemed to require. Feeling against the emigrants grew to fever heat after the declaration of war, and especially after Filnitz. In the army of the allies, containing some 80,000 men in all, were considerable bodies of emigrants under Condé, and the law of August 15 was aimed at them. Two days before, the Assembly had committed the royal family to the Temple; Danton was swinging his machinery into action, terrifying the conservatives, winning popular support by directing the passions of the people against the aristocrats. Longwy fell, Verdun was besieged, Brunswick was approaching Paris. Paris, insane with terror, granted readily to Danton the power of arresting such suspected aristocrats as he might think best to imprison. After the September massacres there was a momentary reaction, when France stood aghast at so bloody an initiation to the new rule. Nevertheless, Robespierre, Danton, Camille Desmoulins, Marat, were the leaders of the 20 new deputies elected to the Convention by Paris on the 5th of September. With such spirits to influence the law-making body, and with

1. Archives Parlementaire, XVI, 13. Special mention is made of Duchilleau. Many priests went to Switzerland and Germany; see "Le Clergé Française en Allemagne" by Victor Pierre, in Revue des Questions Historiques, Vol. 33, page 148.

2. Archives Parlementaire, XLVIII, 181. (August 15, 1792).

Brunswick and his emigrant allies, led by the royal princes, approaching the city, the great law of October, more comprehensive and more severe than any yet, seems the logical response to the situation. This law prescribed the death penalty, not only for emigrants, but for their friends and helpers. Their property was to be confiscated, as indemnity for the war they had caused.¹ Persons having business dealings with emigrants must make a statement as to their affairs, and if these declarations should be proven false, death was the penalty. Means and processes of confiscation were prescribed; all agreements, sales, and other contracts between husband and wife, if one or both had emigrated, were null and void, also any business transactions of an emigrant made since the law of the preceding 9th February.² Finally, the property of the former king and his family was to be sold at auction.³

A week later a law was passed providing that emigrants taken with arms, or found fighting against France, should be killed within 24 hours.⁴ On November 3, they were deprived of one of their last resources, that of going to the colonies; to be caught in the attempt to make such an escape was fatal.⁵ Banishment was made perpetual at about the same time.⁶ Valmy had turned the tide of success in favor of France, but the desire for vengeance grew only more bitter with victory. There was endless controversy concerning the execution of the stringent laws, which gave rise to a

1. This applied to all who left France since July 1, 1789, to live in territories of powers with whom France was at war, and to all public officers sent to such powers, who had been traitors or who had not returned.

2. Duvergier, Vol IV, page 36

3. Archives Parlementaire, Vol. III, page 285

4. Archives Parlementaire, Vol III, page 408

5. Duvergier, Vol V, page 40

6. Archives Parlementaire, Vol III, page 635

series of definitive and prescriptive decrees, beginning November 12, 1792. Children under 16 who might return within a year¹ were excepted from the penalties. The law prescribing the regulations for the certificates of residence, without which no one save the very poorest was safe from possible arrest and confiscation², was followed by one requiring an indemnity from the parents³ of emigrants for each son or daughter who had left the country. The next step was the nullification of all gifts and legacies made by emigrants since July 1, 1789.⁴ Then, the government announced that it would receive no emigrant as the representative of a foreign power.⁵ These laws, passed between the return from Varennes and the trial of the king (December 11) were intended to close every avenue of escape for emigrating French citizens, to deprive them of every civil right and of all means of support. They inclosed them in the continually tightening meshes of a net which should eventually catch all of them and rid the republic of the menace of their very existence. A law passed on the 17th of December, excepting students, notable scholars studying abroad, children being educated in foreign countries, and the families of negotiators of the Republic, shows the liberalism and the sincere desire to be just which characterized the Assembly even in its days of strongest

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 1. | Archives Parlementaire, Vol LIII, page | 368 |
| 2. | " " " " | 432 |
| 3. | " " " " | 551 |
| 4. | " " " " | 575 |
| 5. | " " " " | 625 |

feeling. Possible evasion by real emigrants, under cover of this law, were so carefully guarded against, that it indicates no relaxation of the vigilance of the state.¹

The vindictive spirit of 1793 is evident in its legislation. A new, distinctly aggressive policy shows itself in the voting of a reward of 100 livres to anyone causing the arrest of an emigrant,² and in the decree that anyone who might hide or shelter an emigrant should be severely punished, and that those who should rent or give rooms or a house to any persons not registered, should report such persons at once to the authorities.³ On the 28th of February a comprehensive decree, embracing all the laws then in force,⁴ was passed; this cumulative summary remained in force, with some minor changes, until a new collective law was passed, November 15, 1794. In addition to the restrictions of previous laws, the inheritance of property by emigrants was forbidden, and citizens were encouraged to reveal concealed emigrant property by a reward of one-tenth of whatever was discovered.

In April, 1793, the right of jury trial was denied to captured emigrants; henceforth a military tribunal was to dispose of their cases, within the customary 24 hours.⁵ The opening of the mail of emigrants, a custom established since the beginning of the Revolution,⁶ was legalized in May;⁷ papers of value to the Republic were to be deposited in district archives, money appropriated

1. Archives Parlementaire, Vol. LX, page 102
2. " " " LVIII, page 546. (February 14, 1793)
3. " " " LIX, page 233
4. " " " LIX, page 344
5. " " " LXIII, page 380
6. Lettres d'Aristocrats, M. Fougere to M. Lecoy, page 392.
7. Archives Parlementaire, Vol. LXIV, page 354.

to the state, and any information of possible use reported to the appropriate authorities. In the same month a more definite mode of confiscation than provided for in previous laws was prescribed, and one-eighth of the sums secured from property whose attempted concealment had been frustrated, was to be paid to the denunciator.¹ In July, at the time of the enactment of furiously inhuman decrees against the Vendéens, French commissioners in foreign countries were directed to report to the government at Paris the property of emigrants in the countries to which they had commissions. Considering the abject poverty of most of the emigrants at this time, the law sounds like a joke. That all the laws--many of them too severe to have been literally and universally executed in a country where mercy and justice were not entirely dead--were not executed at all, we may judge from such a decree as that of the 11th of September, 1793, which condemned to 10 years in irons the administrator who should not place emigrant real estate on sale, and to caretakers who did not rent the national domains.² In the late summer and fall of this year the general émigré lists, prescribed by the laws of July 25³ and November 18⁴, began to be made and posted; they were completed, in their first form, by about the beginning of 1794.⁵

1. Archives Parlementaire, Vol. LXXV, page 226. This law was an improved recasting of that of November 25, 1792.

2. Duvergier, Vol. VI, page 158

3. Archives Parlementaire, LXVIII, page 407

4. Duvergier, VI, page 288

5. Duvergier, Vol VI, page 330

In December the sequestration of property was extended to that of¹
the fathers and mothers of emigrants.

Then, having exhausted their ingenuity in devising means of punishing truant French subjects, the Convention turned to English, Spanish, and all hostile foreigners, and decreed that they should be placed on the lists and their property confiscated, as though they were emigrants.² The personal liberty of families of emigrants was further limited by forbidding their wives and daughters to marry foreigners, to leave France, or to sell their property.³ The legislation concerning the administration of sequestered property, and the rights of creditors of emigrants, was continuous and voluminous during all this period. The law of the 26th Brumaire of the Year III summarized this legislation anew, and made special provision for the newly acquired territory.⁴

After the fall of the great Committee a somewhat more humane spirit shows itself in émigré legislation, possible because the necessity for terrorizing was growing less. Robespierre, Couthon and St. Just no longer ruled; about a hundred of the leading terrorists followed them to the guillotine, and the commune seemed a past thing. Jourdan had won Fleury, and the Austrians and Prussians had retired across the Rhine. In Paris the moderate Thermidorians and the jeunesse dorée were still further reducing the power of the mob and of the Jacobin Club, which closed finally on the 12th of November. Lastly, such Girondists as had escaped

1. Duvergier, Vol VI, page 330
2. Duvergier, Vol VII, page 85 (February 27, 1794)
3. Duvergier, Vol VII, page 114. (March 24, 1794)
4. Duvergier, Vol VII, page 318.

with their lives were readmitted to the Convention, and the two extremists Carrier and Fouquier-Tinville were executed. On the same day¹ in which the Convention offered to the Chouans of the Vendée a month in which to lay down their arms and be at rest, those definitely erased from the emigrant lists were restored to their possession, on giving bond for the value of any indemnity² which might yet be required. The feeling against emigrants was not less strong, but better controlled, more conscientious and more careful, from this time on.

Early in 1795, workmen returning to France were exempted from émigré penalties; but they must be real workmen, laboring with their hands.³ Parents of emigrants also, who possessed property, were to be given temporary help, enough to sustain life, until⁴ the question of the sequestration of their property could be settled.⁵ Emigrants, including ecclesiastics, were still without citizen rights, but some compensation to their families was not denied; even those deprived of their pensions, granted for services of husbands or fathers "to the late king's house", were granted a yearly stipend.⁶ So many erasures from the lists were made during this winter, that in April the Convention decreed that no more should be made except by itself.⁷ At this time government lotteries were opened, with confiscated emigrant property as prizes; the mode of

1. December 2, 1794

2. Duvergier, Vol. VII, page 330

3. " " " " 371

4. " " " " 373

5. " " VIII, " 12

6. " " " " 13 (February 6, 1795)

7. " " " " 95

operation was prescribed on May 27.¹ In June the law prohibiting the daughters of emigrants to sell their property or marry foreigners², was repealed, and those claiming the right of erasure from the lists were commanded to put themselves under police guard,³ the idea being that real emigrants would not dare do this.

In 1795, a special law decreed that the accounts of "Louis-Stanislaus-Xavier, Charles-Phillippe Capet, and Louis-Philippe Joseph of Orleans" must be submitted to the Bureau of Accounts,⁴ as were those of the other emigrants.⁵ Further help was voted to the parents of emigrants also.⁶ In August, such emigrants as were still living and were still on the lists were ordered to leave Paris at once and go to their own homes, where they were carefully guarded by the municipalities.⁷

In the Constitution of the Year III, the date from which departing French citizens were accounted emigrants was pushed forward to July 15, 1789,⁷ --just early enough to include Artois in its application. The emigrant laws were left unchanged, and the Corps Legislatif forbidden to make any new exceptions to their execution. The restriction is interesting; it seems to have been consciously intended to check a growing tendency to redemption. The titles of peasants and others who then held the erstwhile property of emigrants was secured by a clause stating that the "property of deserting French citizens is forever and irretrievably forfeited."

1.	Duvergier, Vol. VIII, page	131
2.	" " " "	139
3.	" " " "	150
4.	" " " "	179
5.	" " " "	197
6.	" " " "	219 (August 18, 1795)
7.	" " " "	241.

These provision show the permanent character of the resentment felt by the French for the privileged class which had deserted the country when needed most.

Another reaction shows itself at the end of August, 1795,¹ when all erasures were stopped, and in September, when it was even proposed to revise such erasures as had been made.² Some relatives of emigrants and some non-juring priests were in the new Corps; they were deprived of their right "to exercise public functions" on September 21.³ The defense of the government by Napoleon crushed the struggling hope for a definite reaction in favor of the royalists, and several of Provence's agents were captured after the 13th Vendémiaire (October 5), one being executed. A few days later the Corps decided to publish a list of the emigrants taken to Guiberon,⁴ and to continue the printing of the general lists.⁵ England, after the 13th Vendémiaire, ceased to interfere with French civil troubles, which served further to weaken the emigrant cause; for England had, up to this time, been giving substantial aid to the royalists, hundreds of whom had settled in her domain.

During 1796 the confiscation of property of parents of emigrants continued.⁶ On May 18 of that year, 12 millions had come to the government from this source. Erasures were controlled strictly by the police, acting under the Directory, and were becoming very rare.⁷ But the Council of Five Hundred decided to erase

1. Duvergier, Vol VIII, page 251
2. " " " " 282. (September 19, 1795)
3. " " " " 283
4. " " " " 312
5. " " " " 441
6. " " IX, " 47. (February 19, 1796)
7. " " " " 100

the names of some members elected to its own body,¹ and relations of emigrants who had fought for France were exempted from the usual penalties.² During this period the laws relative to the administration of forfeited estates and the rights of creditors of emigrants are especially numerous. The status and treatment of the deserters seemed at last to be fairly settled, and ceased to be a matter for legislation; the laws are laws of means and modes. Endless litigation, argumentation, corruption, and the pressure of countless other matters dragged out the process of erasing names from the lists. In February, 1797, the Directory ordered the closing of the registers containing petitions for erasure,³ and repeated, as an operative decision of its own, the old law that emigrants had no citizen rights. There were at this time 120,000 persons on the emigrant lists of the Directory, which were not complete.⁴

Napoleon was then (1797) in Italy; having won Rivoli on the 4th of January, he forced the pope to sign the treaty of Tolentino on February 19. The French government was his to command; its attitude toward the old noblesse from this time on depended partly at least on the varying uses to which the master of Destiny could put one faction or another in furthering his own interests. In 1799, a law threatening anew the relatives of emigrants and former nobles and those notoriously opposed to the Revolution, was passed

1. Duvergier, Vol IX, page 51
2. " " " " 54 and 150
3. " " " " 286
4. Ferneron, Vol I, page 228

¹ in July and revoked in November. Under Napoleonic influence, decrees granting further clemency to emigrants and their sympathizers were passed in December. Some were even permitted to return to France. Some 145,000 emigrants remained still outside of France ³, and the laws against them still retained their full force. The list of emigrants was ordered closed the 3rd day of March, 1800. At the close of the century, the situation was, briefly, that the execution of the severe laws lay within the prerogative of the First Consul, and depended upon his will.

Louis XVIII

The news of the dauphin's death reach Verona on the 21st of June, 1795. Provence's proclamation of his assumption of the French crown was issued on the 24th. ⁴ The tone of the proclamation was conciliatory; it offered pardon to all but regicides. The departments of state were reorganized ⁵ with elaborate care, and proclamations to his subjects were issued, as though some semblance to a French kingdom still existed. All Europe smiled at the farce; the French king, possessing himself of all the machinery of the Old Regime but having not so much as a village over which to rule, became somewhat of an international joke. No loyal legions begged his recall, no affectionate people longed for his rule; even the royalists of Paris, emboldened a little during the summer, were crushed on the 13th Vendémiaire. ⁶ In April, 1796, Provence--or, as he now styled himself, Louis XVIII, who had been staying at

1. Duvergier, Vol. XI, page 278 (Section 2)

2. " " XII, page 5

3. Cambridge Modern History, Vol. 9, page 15

4. Michaud, Biographie Universelle, Vol. 25, page 240

5. Daudet, Vol. I, page 287

6. Confidential Correspondence of Napoleon Bonaparte--Letter to Joseph Bonaparte, October 6, 1797, Vol I, page 32.

Verona, was asked to leave Venetian territory. He demurred at first and demanded concessions, but on Napoleon's near approach decided to sacrifice his dignity in the interest of personal safety. Accordingly he went to Switzerland and Baden, and joined Condé in his camp at Riegel in late April. But even with Condé he was denied a refuge. That general, in correspondence with Fichégué at the time, was embarrassed by the presence of the prince. A Swiss bookseller, Fauch-Borel, had proposed to Fichégué that a change of masters might be advantageous, and Fichégué had somewhat eagerly acquiesced, proposing a plan which seemed plausible enough, but which the cautious Condé rejected as not sufficiently sure to warrant adoption. Especially, he found it impracticable because of the chronic lack of funds which always hampered royalist enterprises, and of which the Austrian and English agents never failed to remind them. When Provence arrived he was pleased with Fichégué's idea, and promised him Alsace and Lorraine as a reward in case the conspiracy succeeded. But Thugut had selected Alsace and Lorraine as Austria's booty, and that his presence might not by any chance deprive England and Austria of absolute control, the poor prince was ordered to leave the army at once. He left on the 11th of July, 1796, and turned north, at a venture, having no definite idea of his destination. The Swiss and German towns were closed to him; the bishop of Passau offered to receive his wife, to whom Turin, now in the hands of the French, had become unbearable, but could not risk the presence of the would-be king himself. Dresden and Lübeck would none of him; but finally Blankenburg, in the Duchy of Brunswick, was offered him, and he accepted with such grace and alacrity. ¹ Napoleon says that Foussielgue, French agent, found the court of Turin not averse to an alliance with France. See "Correspondence de Napoleon I^{er}", Vol. 29, page 109 (Paris, 1870)

as the situation demanded.

At Blankenburg "Louis XVIII" took stock of his chances. Here he faced real conditions more squarely than he had done before. His long flight from Verona had shown him plainly how desperately few were his friends, how cruelly powerful his enemies. A great question must be faced; and its decision is scarcely less important, in our study of the career of Provence, because it was, at the time, of no real moment to France, now so soon to be dominated by a man to whom it was no question at all. There were many reasons for thinking that the year 1797 was more favorable than any that had yet passed since 1789, for a restoration. The indomitable faith of the French princes looked for restoration as the sure result of some one of the many sudden turns of the shifting fortunes of that eventful year. When the kingdom was restored to its rightful masters, should it be the old despotic kingdom, or a new kingdom of compromise with the last eight years? Should the new kingdom be absolute or constitutional?

In the busy days at Blankenburg, the Count of Provence debated this above all other questions. As a matter of temporary, or of permanent concession, to gain his own, should he submit to the restrictions imposed on a king by modern ideas of popular rights? The agents at Paris, knowing the ineradicableness of the constitutional ideal, advised submission to it. Many emigrants had long regarded it as the only solution to their problem.¹ Fiehegru urged that in order to unite the many factions, the would-be king must

1. See note, "Sur les émigrés à la fin de 1794" in *Revue Historique*, Vol. VI, (1878) 84.

cease to talk of his ancient prerogatives. In spite of these opinions, and at a time when discretion meant a silence capable of many interpretations, the prince and his advisers clung to their position. The Parisian agents pressed him for an offer of concessions; the new elections, they thought, might be carried for Louis if the right bait were quickly cast. But Louis hesitated, promising evasively to correct abuses, but always "as the father of his people". Catherine II's death in November, 1796, further delayed decision; what would be the policy of Paul I? News of that came early in the next year; Paul had a personal antipathy to Eszterhazy (now the royal agent at St. Petersburg) but he wrote to "the king of France" a most friendly letter, suggesting that he would follow his mother's policy of somewhat passive good-will toward Louis. Then La Vauguyon, Louis' chief minister, was dismissed; it was a hopeful sign to the more liberal of his followers, for La Vauguyon had long led the extreme conservatives. He was succeeded by St. Priest, who brought more of ability to the management of affairs than they had known since the Verona days when d'Aultrignes was in charge. St. Priest was a moderate and a diplomat. He promptly reorganized the agency at Paris, and secured for it a statement from the king that the former constitution of the state might, if absolutely necessary, be modified.³ The royalist council was enjoined to work especially for the control of the May election, which returned a majority for the moderate party, with a royalist, Barbé-

1. Calonne, in his Tableau de l'Europe, had attacked the extreme absolutism of Provence's manifestoes.

2. Baudet, Vol. I, page 381.

3. Baudet, Vol. I, page 388

Marbois, as president of the Council of Ancients. Crowds of emigrants had returned to France since Thermidor, and now boldly proclaimed their views. France seemed to be on the eve of Restoration. If Paul I would help with soldiers and money, Louis hoped soon to return to his France as its king in very truth.

St. Priest was therefore despatched to St. Petersburg, to win the Tzar's coöperation. He was to secure a coalition if possible; if not, at least an asylum more sure than that of Blankenburg, and Paul's support in perpetuating Cande's disintegrating army. Paul received St. Priest kindly, granted him some requests and promised others. But he hesitated to make a coalition which might destroy the peace of Europe. This was in August, 1797; hoping to gain more, the skillful St. Priest stayed on at the Russian court until, at the end of September, the news of the 18th Fructidor reached St. Petersburg. The events of that day caused the projected Restoration to fall as flat as a house of cards blown over. It could not have been altogether unwelcome to the French, but it had no leader of sufficient strength to plan and execute it in the face of existing government. But with the utter failure of the plans of the royalist conspirators, and in the person of that man who had frustrated them, there appeared a bare possibility which grew, as they regarded it, into a new and last hope.

The Abbé La Harpe, who was inscribed on the emigrant lists under his own name, André, and who was known, at different times and on different missions, as Falike, the Abbé de Bellecomb, and David Pachoud, came to Blankenburg late in 1796, after a period of shrewd observation in London and Paris.¹ He was one of the most devoted of the exiled Frenchmen who repeatedly risked their lives

1. Daudet, Vol II, page 23

in attending to the king's business; for the next six years he was employed constantly on difficult and delicate missions for the proscribed king. It was he who, early in 1797, introduced the Marquis of Bésignan at Blakenburg.¹ This gentleman, through the Polish Count of Grabianka, a resident of Avignon, negotiated with Carnot, La Revellière, Letourneur de la Marne, Isard, Revère, Barras, and other members of the Directory and the Revolutionary party. The Directory was incorruptible and even unapproachable to the Parisian agents of Louis; but through Grabianka and Bésignan they proposed terms--garden and places in exchange for their help in reëstablishing the monarchy. Louis promised them safety, although in 1795 he had declared coming vengeance for regicides, the only exception to his general pardon. The scheme might have been realized in action, but for the growing recognition of Napoleon as the coming arbiter of French affairs.

There was, then, no hope of gaining the Directory; acting on that ancient French proverb which advises appeal to the master when appeal to the valet proves vain, Provence authorized La Harpe to negotiate for him with Napoleon Bonaparte. This was on January 29, 1798, two days after receiving the invitation of the Tsar Paul to establish his court at Mitau in Courland. The invitation was accepted, and the little group of Bourbon exiles arrived on March 23, 1798. La Harpe, with his message, sped to France in the meantime. Bonaparte had shown himself a man of ability; if his good sense and ambition equalled his masterly skill in obtaining results, it was scarcely to be doubted, thought the royalists, that he would aid in effecting the Restoration, with some high position in the kingdom, or even a crown in Italy, as his reward. La Harpe pro-

1. Daudet, Vol II, page 29

posed to approach him through Josephine, who had long been a friend to royalists. But before anything could be accomplished, Napoleon left Toulon for Egypt, in May, 1798, not to return until a year from the next October. On his arrival at the Congress of Rastadt, propositions from Provence were again presented to him; but they were accorded scant attention and no encouragement. In 1801, through the third Consul, Lebrun (an old friend of the abbe de Montesquieu, an agent of Provence then at Paris), Napoleon was¹ a third time approached, and maintained his former attitude.

Meantime the king without a throne, in Russia, hoped always that when Napoleon returned from war to politics, it would be as the champion of his cause. A crowd of would-be agents wished to carry his proposals to Bonaparte; La Marre only was fully trusted. Negotiations with Barras were going on all the time; Fienegru, serenely alive after his deportation to Cayenne following the 13th Fructidor, and irrepressibly intriguing, was in London, scheming with Wickham;² Dumouriez was forwarding royalist interests, so far as he dared, with Prince Charles of Hesse in Denmark. There was much agitation, but little progress; many promises, but no visible changes. The life in Courland was more pleasant than the Bourbon prince and his followers had enjoyed for a long time. A small bodyguard, suggestive of royal precaution, and comfortable quarters, with the pleasure of reunion with his wife and niece, miti-

1. Michaud, Biographie Universelle, Vol 25, page 252

2. Wickham was the English "Superintendent of Aliens" at this time; he had also served on the continent as English agent for emigrants and royalists. See: Correspondence of Right Honorable William Wickham.

1
 igated the pain of exile at Mittau. Cardinal Montmorency, the dukes of Guise, Villequier, and Fleury, and the counts of Arvay, St. Priest, and Cosse-Brissac, attended him. Hope revived with the Anglo-Russian treaty, signed December 29, 1798--a treaty having the avowed end of restoring pre-Revolutionary boundaries to France. Russia was to furnish 45,000 men, and England a preliminary sum of £ 225,000 and a subsidy of £ 75,000 per month. The working, waiting Louis at Mittau, and the lazy, self-absorbed Charles at Holyrood, hoped much from this agreement.

2
 Weiried finally by the impotent efforts of his agents, Louis himself wrote to Napoleon; would he assist an effort to restore to France her true and rightful sovereign? Napoleon vouchsafed no answer to his appeal until after Marengo, then sent 3
 an answer that was plain to the point of brutality:

"Your return is not desired; it could be made only over 100,000 corpses."

After that, the Bourbon prince resigned himself to the only possible course; which was to wait until the rising Napoleonic tide should have reached its full and spent itself. Much sorrow and disappointment embittered the waiting-time. The ill-success of the Russian forces under Luvorov and the victories of Massena cooled the enthusiasm of Paul I for the French princes to such an extent that he deserted his erstwhile protégé, and in midwinter

1. Madame Royal, as the daughter of Louis XVI was called, was exchanged in 1795 for several French prisoners held by the Austrians, and spent the next three years as an involuntary guest at the Viennese court. She arrived at Mittau June 4, 1798, and was married to the Duke of Angoulême a week later.

2. Cf. February 20, 1800. Cambridge Modern History, Vol. IX, page 16

3. Cf. September 7, 1800, Correspondence de Napoleon. I^{er}, Vol 6, 454.

ordered him to leave Mittau. The prince journeyed to Weszel, and after many hardships was granted, through the kindness of the Queen of Prussia, an asylum at Warsow in Prussian Poland. Having an income from the Spanish king, and after Alexander's succession one also from Russia, the royal family was able to live quietly there, received on sufferance by the Germans, but enjoying the warm friendship of several noble Polish families.

In 1803 a curious reversal of the former propositions for a settlement between Provence and Napoleon took place. M. Meyer, on the 26th of February of that year, presented himself to the exiled and unrecognized "king of France" and offered him formally an immense money compensation in return for his voluntary renunciation of the throne of France. With the dignity which at critical did not desert Louis, he declined the offer; he would not, he intimated, lose honor with all the rest. Considering the hopelessness of the outlook at that time, and the condition of his finances, his action, while the only possible one consistent with his ideas and his previous career, is not unworthy of admiration.

¹
With this response to the ruler of France, we may leave the history of the careers of the refugee Bourbon princes. Their lives and expressed opinions were such that, if understood by that large number of French citizens who always, in their hearts, entertained with their progressive ideas a loyal regard for the legitimate monarchy, would have shown them plainly how utterly incompatible a restoration would have been with any appreciable degree

1. See Michaud, Biographie Universelle, Vol 25, page 252-3, for the response of Louis to Napoleon.

of progress. The experiment--no less an experiment because it was unconsciously so--of 1815--1848, proved the futility of any effort to retain the Bourbon rule with the modern, progressive democracy of France.

Bibliography

Decrees.

- x Archives Parlementaire de 1787 à 1860.
Paris, 1879-
- x Duvergier: Collection Complete des Lois, etc. (1788 and following)
Paris, 1834 -- 100 vols. to 1907.

Sources.

- Manuscrit inedit de Louis XVIII. Paris, 1839.
- Vaublanc, V.M.V.: Souvenirs. Paris, 1841. 2 vols.
- x Vaissiere, Pierre de : Lettres d'Aristocrates. Paris, 1907.
- x Bonaparte, Napoleon: Correspondence. Paris, 1870.
- Louis XVIII: Lettres et instructions de Louis XVIII au comte de Saint-Priest, etc. Paris, 1845.
- Louis XVIII: Relation d'un voyage à Bruxelles et à Coblenz.
Paris, 1823.
- x Bailleu, Paul: Preussen und Frankreich von 1795 bis 1807. Leipzig,
1881-7. 2 vols.
- Frampton, Mary: Journal, from 1779 until 1846. London, 1885.
- Wickham, William: Correspondence. London, 1870. 2 vols.

Periodical Publications

- x Revue des Questions Historiques. Paris, 1806--
83 vols. to April, 1903.
- x La Revolution Francaise. Paris, 1881--
54 vols. to June, 1908.
- La Revue Francaise. Paris, 1881--
54 vols. to 1909.
- x Revue Historique. Paris, 1884--
99 vols. to 1909.

1. Those marked with an "x" are in the University of Illinois Library.

Secondary Works

- x
 Michaud: Biographie Universelle. Paris. 45 vols.
- x
 Daudet, Ernest, Histoire de l'Emigration pendant la Revolution
 Française. Paris, 1905. 3 vols.
- x
 Montgaillard, G.H.R., Histoire de France. Paris. 1828-35. 9 vols.
- x
 Ferneron, Henri: Histoire General des Emigres. pendant la Revolution
 Française. Paris, 1884-90. 3 vols.
- Lebon, Andre: L'Angleterre et l'emigration française de 1794 à
 1801. Paris, 1882.
- x
 Gallois, Leonard: Histoire de la Convention Nationale. Paris,
 1834-7. 7 vols.





UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 082196673